बहुत गौर से देखा है। जो आपका प्रश्न था क्या हम इस पर गौर कर रहे है, इसको टेकल कैसे कर रहे है। हम बिलकुल कर रहे हैं। हमने एक खास साइंटिफीक मिशन बना रखा है एडिबल आयलज पर जिसमें आते हुए 5–6 साल में हम बहुत हद तक इस में सेलफ सफिशियेंसी पाएंगे और सब को हम दे पायेंगे।

SHRI KRISHNA KUMAR BIRLA: Sir, apart from the various measures which the Government wants to take, from the long-range point of view, to increase the production of oilseeds, as far as the immediate future is concerned, unless and until there is more import of edible oil, the prices will not go down. This year there has been a fall in groundnut production in Gujarat. The production has fallen from 60 lakh tonnes to 40 lakh tonnes. And I hear that the import has gone down. My question is: will the Government consider increasing the import of edible oil immediately so as to bring down the prices in the open market and to improve supply in the public distribution system?

SHRI H.K.L. BHAGAT: Sir, I do not think that there is that situation of panic which the hon. Member is pointing out. Whatever imports we need, we have already made arrangements for it. We are giving imported oil as required to the State of Maharashtra and to the State of Gujarat. I am sending a special team of officers to these States where this problem exists, and the problem will be sorted out. We have plans for importing what is necessary. We do not have to import what is not necessary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question No 404.

States having low per capita income

*404. SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what is the number of those States which were having per capita incomes below the national average level since the year 1980; and

(b) what steps have been taken by the Central Government to improve their position?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND *MINISTER OF STATE IN THE* MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI AJIT PANJA): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) According to the official estimates of Net State Domestic Product released by the respective State Governments, 15 States were having their per capita income below the National average for the years 1980-81 to 1983-84.

(b) The Central Government has taken several steps to improve the position of such States. The important measures, among these are:

(i) Transfer of resources from the Central Government to the State Governments for meeting their Plan expenditure according to a formula which is weighted in favour of the backward States whose per capita income is below the national average.

(ii) Devolution of non-Plan resources in accordance with the award of the Eighth Finance Commission which favours the backward States and seeks to reduce disparity between the States in addition to covering the revenue gap.

(iii) Providing Special Central Assistance for the development of backward areas in the States such as, hill areas, desert areas, drought prone areas and also areas having concentration of tribal population.

(iv) Providing special incentives in the form of investment subsidy and concessional finance for accelerating the industries development

of the industrially backward regions in the States; and

(v) While making State-wise allocation of resources under the poverty alleviation programme, more emphasis is given to the incidence of poverty during the Seventh Plan as compared to that in Sixth Plan. Naturally, the States with higher poverty ratio will get higher allocations of funds for these programme.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, in the statement the hon. Minister has stated that 15 States were having their per capita income below the national average for the years 1980-81 to 1983-84. Sir, it is an incorrect figure. To an Unstarred Question in the Lok Sabha on 17-4-1985, the hon. Minister Mr. Narayanan, stated that in the year 1980-81, the number of States who were having a per capita income below the national average was 18; in 1981-82, 17 and then 16. Of course, the figure is immaterial. I have asked for the figures from the year 1980. It does not mean that earlier these States were having a per capita income above the national average. These States from the First Plan period are having a per capita income below the national average. For example in Tamil Nadu, from the year 1967, the per capita income was always below the national average despite the fact that: (1) the State Government has properly implemented the Plan allocations; (2) Tamil Nadu is in the third rank in loan facilities from the Industrial Investment Corporation; and (3) the 20 point programme is successfully implemented in our State. Still the per capita income is below the national average. Our finding is that after 1967, the Centre has not started any few industry under the public sector; even it has not sanctioned expansion schemes like Hindustan Photo Films, Salem Steel Plant and Madras Integral Coach Factory...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are going very much out of the scope of the question.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Even under the Seventh Five Year Plan the allocation is inadequate. My point is that most of the States which are having a per capita income below the national average are not getting adequate investment from the Centre under the public sector. Will the Government come forward to increase the allocation under the public sector for these States to increase their per capita income?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: Investment in the public sector is not the only factor in increasing the per capita income of the States. Sir, only one thing I want to impress upon the Members through you, Sir. Now, we find that there is no one method for ascertaining the State per capita income and therefore, we are making a format ready so that there is one method. So far as the Central assistance is concerned, it is not correct that the States are not being given their share which are required to be given to them according to certain parameters laid down. In accordnce with the parameters laid down, each State is given priority taking into consideration all the factors which indicate special assistance Sir, if it is a hill area, special assistance is given. If it is a desert area, special assistance is given. So for as the poverty alleviation programmes are concerned for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, special assistance is given. Beside, that, there is the Gadgil formula which has been modified to some extent so that this special assistance could be given to the States for increasing their per capita income. It is not correct to say that there has been any discrimination made against the Tamil Nadu Government or the State of Tamil Nadu.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Aruna, you put your second supplementary.

SHRI ALADI ARUNA *alias* V. ARUNACHALAM: Sir, the Centre has taken some steps to improve the per capita income of the various States and there is no difference of opinion on that. But, Sir, despite these measures, nearly for three decades, those States are having a per capita income which is below the national average, below the national level, and it is so not only in the case of Tamil Nadu but also in more than fifteen States. So, what are the alternative measures that are going to be taken by the Centre?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: Sir, as I have already stated, the Gadgil formula, as it was before, has been modified since to some extent, to a certain extent, to take into consideration this very factor which has been mentioned by the honourable Member. Previously according to the Gadgil formula, population weightage was 60 per cent and now also it is 60 per cent. But the variation has been made for per capita income, that is, variation has been made for assistance allocated to the States having a per capita income below the national level which was, under the Gadgil formula, 10 per cent and now, Sir, it has been doubled it has been made 20 per cent. This is the impact that has been made now and this is the criterion which we want to bring in so that the imbalance is removed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Prof. Lakshmanna.

PROF. C. LAKSHMANNA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the honourable Minister has just now stated that there is a modified Gadgil formula. While the modification was being made, was it also kept in mind that the establishment of industries would be one of the methods by which the per capita income of a particular State could be improved? If it has been taken into consideration, how has this been incorporated in the modified Gadgil formula?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: Sir, the actual Gadgil formula takes into account population, per capita tax effort, per capita income, irrigation and power projects, and special programmes. These are the main things on which the modification has been made. But, Sir, for the setting up of industries, a separate classification has been made. A "No-Industry' district has been categorised as "A". Then there are areas where there is not much of an impact and they have been categorised as "B". Then there are industries which have been categorised as "C". For "No-Industry" districts, special assistance is given like bank loans and also, subsidies have already been announced.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, Mr. Satya Pal Malik.

श्री सत्यपाल मलिक : श्रीमान, केन्द्र सरकार राज्यों को संसाधनों का आवंटन करती है । मैं यह जानना चाहता हूं कि क्या यह देखने की कोशिश होती है कि उन संसाधनों का इस्तेमाल उन राज्यों के डवलपमेंट के काम में होता है कि नहीं और अगर नहीं तो किन राज्यों की आपको शिकायतें मिली है कि पापूलिस्ट कामों में इन संसाधनों का दुरुपयोग हुआ है ?

SHRI AJIT PANJA: Sir, we are keeping a watch so far as the earmarked sectors are concerned. So far as the States are concerned, for their Plans, for the State Plans, a block grant is given and, in fact, Sir, in the Seventh Five Year Plan the net Central assistance for the State Plans out of the total of Rs. 80,698 crores for the whole of India, is Rs. 29,737 crores. So far as having a shift in the case of the specified earmarked sector is concerned, we are now monitoring it. But if the total amount of the State Plan is not spent, then it is very difficult to find out whether there has been any diversification.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question Hour is over.

12.00 NOON

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION NO. 1

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, we take up Short Notice Question No. 1 of

Shri Dipen Ghosh. The Minister will read the answer because the statement has not been distributed to Members.

Separatist movement in Darjeeling District (West Bengal) by GNLF

*1. SHRI DIPEN GHOSH:†
SHRI CHITTA BASU:

Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are aware that the Gorkha National Liberation Front (GNLF) has been carrying on a divisive and separatist movement in Darjeeling district (West Bengal) and also mis-interpreting clause 7 of the Indo-Nepal Treaty and has also given a call for observing the ensuing Independence Day as a "Black Day"; and

(b) if so, what steps Government are taking to check the anti-national activities of the front?

THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI BUTA SINGH): (a) and (b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

The Gorkha National Liberation Front have been demanding the creation of a State of Gorkhaland within the Indian Union and also the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty of 1950. Article 7 of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty Grants certain reciprocal privileges to Nepali citizens in India and Indian citizens in Nepal and does not adversely affect Indian citizens of Nepali origin. The demand for the abrogation of the Indo-Nepal Friendship Treaty is, therefore misplaced.

2. According to report available it appears that the Gorkha National Liberation Front has a programme of boycotting the Independence Day celebrations on August 15 and instead would be resorting to the hoisting of black flags and wearing of black badges on that day.

3. The law and order problems created by the agitation of the Gorkha National Liberation Front have to be handled by the State Government. The Central Government will provide Central parliamentary forces and other appropriate assistance required by the State Government in this regard. The Chief Minister of West Bengal met the Union Home Minister at Delhi on 6-8-86 and it was decided by them that the Central Government and the State Government would fully coordinate in dealing with the situation and that forces weakening the unity and integrity of the country would be dealt with firmly.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Before I put my supplementary arising out of the statement just now read out by the Minister of State for Home Affairs. I would like to draw your attention and through you of the entire House to a particular fact that on 23rd December 1983, Mr. Subhash Geising, President of Gorkha National Liberation Front, had addressed a memorandum to his Majesty. King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah of Nepal endorsing copies of that memorandum to the heads of various foreign countries including the President and the Prime Minister of India. A copy of this memorandum was released to the press on 21st March, 1985. I am not going to read the entire text of that memorandum. But in order to frame my supplementaries, I may please be permitted to quote certain excerpts. If I cross two minutes limit...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will excuse you.

SHRI DIPEN GHOSH: Thank you, Sir, First of all, I quote one particular except wherein it has been stated that "even 36 years after Bharat Independence, the settled ethnic race of the Gorkhas of more than 6 millions is living as degraded human beings in every part of the country in

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Dipen Ghosh.